

DAYLIGHT

Creation Science for Catholics

Patrons

St.Thomas Aquinas [March]

St.Michael [Sept.]

St.Bonaventure [July] The Immaculate Conception [Dec.]

Number 14

Winter 1994/5

Contents

| | |
|--|----|
| Editorial and News | 2 |
| Science and the Days of Creation The Editor | 4 |
| Evolutionist Deception | |
| Newman Graduate Education | 16 |
| The Funeral of a Great Myth [extracts] | |
| C.S.Lewis | 26 |
| Artificial Evolution ? Professor Maciej Giertych . | 28 |
| "Telegraphology" [news items] | 31 |
| "Drama in the Rocks" [new video] | 34 |

---oooOooo---

Honorary Member

Professor Maciej Giertych, B.A.,M.A.(Oxon),Ph.D.,D.Sc.

Secretary and Editor

Anthony L.G.Nevard B.Sc.

19 Francis Avenue, St.Albans, Herts AL3 6BL, England.

EDITORIAL

I recently received a 'home-made' plain postcard from a Catholic priest in South India, saying:

"Please kindly put me on your mailing list and send me your beautiful publication, books, old audio and videotapes on a regular basis urgently. I love to have them. God bless you. Thank you. Since we are very poor please send as a gift; pictures of your country are most welcome.

*Yours sincerely,
Rev. G.J. "*

This is the first communication I have had from India, where poverty restricts the dissemination of creationist materials which most readers take for granted. Thanks to your donations, I was able to send a few new audiotapes and printed matter, and complimentary copies of **DAYLIGHT**. If any reader would like to offer any other materials, or a donation specifically for this kind of 'outreach', please let me know. If preferred, I can give you the address. (Surface mail is not very dear - e.g. £3.36 for 1 kg.)

BCS Journal Alert

The Biblical Creation Society has now produced two issues of a useful new venture - a collection of abstracts from major creationist journals of recently published articles. Issue two includes citations from:

Creation Science Movement;

Institute for Creation Research;

Origins, Biblical Creation Society;

Creation Ex Nihilo Technical Journal

Creation Research Society Quarterly;

Creation Ex Nihilo;

Origins, Geoscience Research Institute.

About 400 abstracts are cited, classified under ten headings.

This series is included in the annual subscription for 'Origins' of £10, and should be a very useful source for writers and researchers. If interested, contact:

BCS, PO Box 22, Rugby, Warwickshire, CV22 7SY, UK.

CISE

This acronym refers to 'Christians in Science Education'. Readers involved in education, especially if concerned with the issues of Science and Religion, could find their Newsletter interesting. It appears twice a year, contains a wide range of articles on about 20 sides of A4, and costs £5 per annum. The Chairman is Michael Poole, and the Secretary/Editor is John Bausor. I must stress, however, that (a) it is not a Catholic organisation, and is associated with other Protestant groups;

(b) it is led by theistic evolutionists - Mike Poole has written several books on Science and Religion, and I have attended a good talk he gave on the nature of science and its limitations. However, their stance is not supportive of young-earth creationism, though there are some members of CISE who are trying to promote this position through it. The Editor invited me to submit an article, and I sent a review praising Richard Milton's book: 'The Facts of Life' which attacks evolutionism. I never even received an acknowledgement. Nevertheless, as a science teacher, I appreciate the positive religious content in contrast to the totally secular "School Science Review".

"WATCHMAKER"

Fr.Becker continues to produce his attractively-printed monthly Newsletter, reporting on 'Morning Star Catholic Origins Society'. It is hoped to convoke an "International Symposium on Origins" at a Catholic university this summer. May I invite your prayers for the success of this admirable initiative.

Fr.Becker mails from PO Box 189,

'CREATION REDISCOVERED'.

The first print run has all been distributed, and I regret I have no copies left. Please try Holy Cross Bookshop, 4 Brownhill Road, London SE6 2EJ. Tel:081 461 0896

POLITE REMINDERS

Subscriptions please, if not paid for 1995.

Change of address - please let me know.

Orders for books etc.- please make it clear to whom it is to be sent, and the address, to help avoid delays.

Thank you again for all your support. God bless you.

SCIENCE AND THE DAYS OF CREATION

Anthony Nevard

The first chapter of the Book of Genesis describes the Creation of the world as a series of distinct acts of God over a period of six successive days. Unlike the rest of Holy Scripture, these events can have had no human witness at all, so this test constitutes direct Divine Revelation. All Holy Writ is inspired by God, and is consequently without error, yet the Catholic Church has never taught that all the details of the Creation account had to be understood literally. For centuries, theologians have freely discussed many mysterious aspects of the early chapters of Genesis. Until very recently, the theory of Evolution was widely believed to be a proven fact, and the creation days therefore symbolic only. Yet it is an extraordinary phenomenon that many scientists have now become convinced that the Biblical account may offer a scientifically superior explanation of our origins! It is hoped that this article will challenge more Catholics to give these new theories, totally in conformity with traditional doctrine, their serious consideration.

The Doctrine of Creation

The Church teaches as 'de fide' dogma thus:

All that exists outside God was, in its whole substance, produced out of nothing by God. (1)

This expresses the same foundational truth of the Creeds, echoing the very first verse of Genesis : "In the beginning God created heaven and earth."

All false philosophies concerning the origin of the world are refuted.

1. It refutes atheism, because the universe was created by GOD.
2. It refutes pantheism, for God is transcendent over that which he created.
3. It refutes polytheism, for ONE God created all things.
4. It refutes materialism, for matter had a beginning.
5. It refutes dualism, because God was alone when He created.
6. It refutes humanism, because God, not man, is the ultimate reality.
7. It refutes evolutionism, because God created all things. (2)

This opening verse of the Old Testament is unique in all literature, science and philosophy, as it describes the creation of all existence - matter, space and time - by a single God, contrasting with mythical, pagan or naturalistic accounts.

The Hebrew name for God used in the first Creation account is 'Elohim', a title which stressed His majesty and omnipotence. This word has a plural ending and can therefore mean 'gods' - this may be a hint at the Trinity of Divine Persons, as we also read in verse 26 "Let us make man to our image and likeness," suggesting a council within the Godhead.

It is significant that the Hebrew 'bara' is used for 'created', which is used for the divine act of calling into existence from nothing (ex nihilo). Later the terms 'asah' (making) or 'yatsar' (forming) are used, meaning the organisation of existing materials into more complex systems. The word bara cannot therefore imply any kind of evolutionary process was involved at the very beginning of time, when matter and energy came into being. The universe must have a finite age, but the Church has never defined it, and it is probable that science will never be able to determine it precisely.

The Pattern of Creation

| Day | Regions | Day | Occupants |
|-----|--|-----|--|
| 1 | Heavens - earth; waters - light; Day - Night | 4 | Sun (for Day) - Moon (for Night); stars (for signs, seasons, days, years) |
| 2 | Waters (divided); Firmament (atmosphere) | 5 | Water creatures ; Birds (air dwellers) |
| 3 | Earth (dry land) - Seas Herbs, seed plants, trees | 6 | Cattle, creeping things, beasts, Man. (dwellers on land) |

Day 7 : God rested : He blessed and sanctified this day

Interpretation of Genesis 1.

The Bible was written for our religious instruction and edification, not to train us in the physical or natural sciences. "The earth He has given to the children of men" (Ps.113:16). Although the Church insists that Genesis is truly historical, we are not to expect the sacred writers to follow the strict norms of modern scientific reason. They wrote according to the understandable modes of expression of their day, in regard to language used and order selected.

The descriptions of physical nature are used to explain and illustrate the mysteries of God, and form the secondary or subordinate element in the text. The days of creation do not have to be considered as 24-hour days, the events may not have occurred in the order given, and the organisms' names do not have to be understood in their modern biological sense.

It is also possible that copying or translation errors may have been made, and undue reliance should not be put on all individual words in the text. The principal element is the religious truths contained therein, which are essentially those propositions of faith, morals and history that are reiterated elsewhere in the Scriptures, especially in the New Testament, and have been traditionally taught by the Catholic Church.

A succinct version of the basic doctrines of Creation was the opening of St. Paul's disputation with the pagan Greek philosophers:

"God, who made the world and all things therein, He being Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands ... it is he who giveth to all life, and breath and all things; and hath made of one, all mankind, to dwell upon the whole face of the earth, determining appointed times and the limits of their habitation." Acts 17:24-26.

It must not be imagined that we are free to dismiss as false any inessential Scriptural passages. "It is absolutely wrong," says Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical 'Providentissimus Deus', "and it is forbidden either to narrow inspiration to certain parts only of the Scripture, or to admit that the sacred writer has erred ... The system of those who limit divine inspiration to matters of faith and morals cannot be tolerated."

For the Catholic, the proximate rule of faith is the Church's infallible authority, necessary for the correct interpretation of the doctrines God has revealed, whether these be contained in Scripture or Tradition. Private interpretation of the Bible must be subject to the Church's guidance, never contrary to the solemn teaching of the Church (the "Analogy of Faith"), the defined meaning of a certain text, or the consensus of the Fathers on a doctrine of faith or morals. (3)

Creation and Miracles

In both the act of creation 'ex nihilo' and a miraculous phenomenon, we assume the direct extraordinary act of the Divinity. A predictable and natural event would hardly be thought a miracle. In creating the world, God used no outside cause or pre-existing matter. Only God can create in this theological sense. He is said to be the primary Cause - all other causes (secondary causes = creatures) presuppose His creative action in order to exist and so to act. This creative act gave existence to the world, constituting the essences or species of natural agents acting in it, and establishing patterns, rhythms and laws according to which these natures act on, or are acted on by, each other. These created agents operate within limits which can only be modified by direct intervention of the Creator, commonly called a miracle. Rational creatures, through free-will and intelligence, are capable of a certain directing development of the world, for example in artistic 'creative' work. (4)

When God is said to be Creator, He alone is the principal Cause, directly responsible for the specific effect. When He is said to work a miracle, He may or may not utilise pre-existing creatures, yet He is the principal Cause of the effect which He wills. "In the

beginning was the Word ... all things were made by Him, and without Him was made nothing that was made." (John 1:1-3).

It is quite logical that modernists who accept evolution also doubt Biblical miracles. Fr. Patrick O'Connell recognised the connection: "Atheists postulate a universe that has evolved blindly from eternal matter without any divine intervention .. Many non-Catholics, especially evolutionists, restrict God's intervention to one initial act, but Catholics know, or should know, that there is constant divine intervention: that divine intervention is necessary for the conservation of the universe; that it was necessary for the creation of vegetable and sentient life, for the creation of each human soul; that there has been special divine intervention in the Incarnation and Redemption and in the miracles of both the Old and the New Testaments." (5)

An important and related matter is the question of 'apparent age'. The logical principle must be accepted that direct creation from nothing would produce a creature that in the normal course of time would be considered to have had a natural past history. For example, when Adam was created as a man, he presumably would not have had a navel (the lack of which could hardly be considered an imperfection in his nature!) He had no human parents or childhood, so he was endowed with infused knowledge from God. Adam and Eve would have appeared as adults, uniquely of all mankind. Some people have argued that this appearance of age when they actually had no real 'age', would have been a kind of deception by God, incompatible with the Truth. But then Christ would also stand accused in His miracles, for example restoring sight to the man born blind, or turning water into wine. The perfect eyes and excellent wine also originated by divine intervention. (6)

Creation and Science

Since the publication of Darwin's 'Origins of Species' in 1859, highly qualified scientists have disagreed about the subject of evolution. Sincere and informed Catholics and other Christians still do, but in contrast to Victorian times, the number of scientists who reject evolution has greatly increased in the past twenty years. (7) Atheists and humanists, who exert great influence in the scientific establishment, the media and education, have kept this undeniable fact well hidden from the public, as they are well aware of the threat to their power of maintaining modern anti-Christian attitudes. Belief in the Genesis record of creation is always strenuously claimed to be antithetical to the whole basis of modern science, as scientist Michael Denton wrote:

"The entire scientific ethos and philosophy of modern western man is based to a large extent upon the central claim of Darwinian theory that humanity was not born by the creative intervention of a deity but by a completely mindless trial-and-error selection of random molecular patterns. The cultural importance of evolution theory is therefore immeasurable, forming as it does the centrepiece, the crowning achievement, of the naturalistic view of the world, the final triumph of secular thesis, which, since the end of the middle ages has displaced the old naive cosmology of Genesis from the Western mind." (8)

In recent years, even some evolutionists have admitted that the theory of evolution is not science. Dr. Colin Patterson, of the British Museum (Natural History), cites Sir Karl Popper's analysis which shows that: "proof or certainty exists only in mathematics and in logic ... science is distinguished from ... metaphysics, or myth, not by proof, but by the possibility of disproof. The only characteristic of scientific theories is that they have consequences which might be falsified by observation or experiment, and a scientist is a person who is willing to relinquish his theory when it is falsified or refuted." He considers evolution under two aspects:

- (a) The general theory of common ancestry of organic life. "This process must be unique and unrepeatable, like the history of England. This part of the theory is therefore a historical theory, about unique events, and unique events are, by definition, not part of science, for they are unrepeatable and so not subject to test ... biologists can make no predictions about the future evolution of any particular species, and they cannot explain past evolution, but only produce interpretations, or stories, about it."
- (b) The idea that the cause of evolution is natural selection. "This is not scientific because the expression 'survival of the fittest' makes no predictions except 'what survives is fit', and so is tautologous." (9)

Popper calls evolution 'a metaphysical research programme', and warns of the danger it may become 'an intellectual fashion, a substitute for religion, an entrenched dogma'. It may also be thought of, like creation science, as a 'model' - a theoretical framework in which the data are fitted, so that competing models can be compared to test logically which is the better, or truer, model.

Evolution philosophy assumes (without proof) that a natural cause must always be the best explanation of the origin of everything observed in the world, and imaginary scenarios have been constructed, stretching back into inconceivably distant time, to explain all existence without reference to the supernatural. It is true that scientific investigation can only deduce causes from effects in the realm of 'secondary causes', i.e. natural laws. Where God is the primary cause, through an act of creation or a miracle, no scientific test can prove this fact positively. Human reason, aided by scientific data, can serve to eliminate all known possible natural causes, leaving only a supernatural explanation of the observed phenomenon. In the case of creation, science cannot tell us the exact state of the world as God created it, nor can creation be repeated or predicted. Creation, like evolution, is not a scientific theory. Yet they can still be tested by logic and reason.

In the writer's opinion, evolution has more claim to be considered scientific than creation, for two important reasons:

- (a) It is theoretically possible that a mechanism of inter-specific evolutionary change might be conceived and demonstrated scientifically in the future. (Of

course, this would still not establish for certain theories of past events.) Darwin claimed that artificial selection of domesticated varieties did so, and evolutionists rely heavily on so-called 'evolution in action' (actually only natural selection of varieties within a species) to support their beliefs.

- (b) No scientific theory or experiment could even be imagined that could demonstrate, predict or even described the process and mechanism of creation, or even prove it possible, owing to the Cause being supernatural.

Most evolutionists would happily concur with the view that evolution is more scientific than creation. Logically, then, refutation of evolution by scientific facts has a stronger scientific basis than trying to disprove creation by science, which is impossible!

Creation Science maintains that there are no natural causes that can explain the world, life and mankind, and that a Creator must logically be the proven Cause of their existence, order and beauty. Unlike the evolutionist, the creationist is open to the possibility that not everything had a material origin and can be explained in scientific terms. He has no problem accepting all the factual evidence - he realises there are still many mysteries, but he has no narrow-minded prejudice against supernatural causes. As St. Paul noted: "For the invisible things of Him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." [Rom.1:20]

"By faith we understand that the world was framed by the word of God; that from invisible things visible things might be made." [Heb.11:3].

For the Christian, it must be further appreciated that the religious truths communicated to us by Divine Revelation are of the supernatural order, whereas the inferences we may draw of God's existence and nature merely by the light of reason are of a lower natural order. Fr. Wilmers wrote:

"The science of religion affords the highest and fullest certainty conceivable. For the truths upon which it rests are attested by the authority, that is, by the wisdom and truthfulness of God Himself, while the principles of other sciences rest upon the light of reason. As far then as God's intelligence surpasses the knowledge of man, so far does the certainty of the science of religion excel that of the other sciences." (10)

Science, of its very nature, cannot answer the crucial questions about our true origins. A person who places more reliance on fallible pseudo-scientific hypotheses than their powers of reason, and who closes his mind to the infallible Revelation of the Creator, stands accused of wilful ignorance and bigotry. Such heathen philosophy is not new ... "For professing themselves to be wise, they became fools ... Who changed the truth of God into a lie and worshipped and served the creature rather than the Creator ... they liked not to have God in their knowledge." [Rom.1:22,25,28]. The rest of the passage describes the immorality which St. Paul imputes to those who "detain the truth of God in injustice."

Some Catholics claim that evolution is God's method of creation, and therefore His existence and nature can be known from evolution. (11) Non-believers stoutly deny this, and recognise the misunderstanding inherent in the ambiguous use of the word 'creation'. They also reject any reference to supernatural aid in what they claim is a scientific theory. Patterson gives brief consideration to the alternative to evolution: "All creation theories are purely metaphysical. They make no predictions about the activities of the Creator, except that life as we know it is the result of His plan. Since we do not know the plan, no observation can be inconsistent with it. At one extreme there is the fundamentalist view that evidence of evolution, such as fossils, was built into the newly-created rocks to tempt us or test our faith. At the other extreme is the person to whom evidence of evolution only pushes the activity of the Creator further and further into the past." (12) Patterson completely ignores the position of modern creation scientists, none of whom hold either of the 'extreme' views he stated above. Henry Morris explains that, in the late nineteenth century, "Philip Gosse, a Fellow of the Royal Society and prominent zoologist, as well as a member of the Plymouth Brethren, tried to resolve the problem [of recent creation and flood geology] by a rather extreme exposition of the Biblical doctrine of creation of apparent age, even involving the creation of fossils in the rocks. This idea was itself un-biblical and attracted few followers. (13) [my emphasis]. Far from ignoring fossils, modern creationists interpret them as supportive of the Bible and destructive of evolutionary theory. Patterson is also dismissive of theistic evolution, referring to "vitalist theories which accept that evolution has occurred, but propose that its course has been guided or directed towards certain ends by some vital force, universal consciousness or striving for perfection. Vitalist theories are purely metaphysical, for they make no predictions about the past or future activities of the various occult agents which are supposed to guide or direct evolution. Most vitalist theories seem to be only modified creation theories." (14) It is apparent that, for non-believers, any attempt to introduce 'creation' is seen as an attack on their naturalistic world-view. Their exclusive faith in Science could be seen as pride, in refusing to accept the necessity to have certain truths revealed to them by an Intellect higher than their own.

Genesis and Science

It is important to realise that the defeat of Darwinism does not automatically restore the credibility of the Days of Creation. The principal areas of science in conflict with the literal days are:

- (a) theories of organic evolution;
- (b) theories of sedimentary rock formation;
- (c) geographical theories e.g. continent and mountain formation;
- (d) physical processes e.g. radioactive decay, suggesting a vast age;
- (e) astronomical theories e.g. the 'Big Bang'.

Creationists have proposed alternative theories to explain the known factual data which usually fit the scientific evidence better than the evolutionary theories. Many publications

and organisations now make these new theories more accessible than ever before. It may surprise the reader to find how flimsy most of the popular scientific beliefs actually are - for example, these quotations in reference to astronomy:

"I suspect that the sun is 4.5 billion years old. However, given some new and unexpected results to the contrary, and some time for frantic recalculation and theoretical readjustment, I suspect that we could live with Bishop Ussher's value for the age of the Earth and the Sun. I don't think we have much in the way of observational evidence in astronomy to conflict with that." John Eddy. (15)

"But it is well to remember that the big bang theory has been built on just three pieces of observational evidence: the expansion of the Universe; the existence of the microwave background radiation; and the cosmic abundance of helium. Never has such a mighty edifice been built on such insubstantial foundations." ['Cosmology in Crisis', New Scientist 21 Dec. 1991, p3.]

The Days of Creation in Christian Teaching

Even at the time of Christ, there were scholars who believed that the universe was created simultaneously, and that the Six Days were an allegorical device. Six was considered a perfect 'mystic' number, being the product of three dualities or two trinities. This view rejected the idea of '24-hour days' and also the sequence of creative acts. St. Gregory of Nyssa and St. Augustine held that the days may have been longer periods, during which God's laws caused the appearance of living things (by spontaneous generation) following the initial Creation. St. John Chrysostom and St. Basil, however, took a literal view of the Days. Some Catholic evolutionists have lauded St. Augustine as a superior scientist well ahead of his time, but they tend not to mention that he also considered that the Earth was flat, and that the sphericity of the Earth was in opposition to Scripture! St. Basil accepted that the Earth was round. (16)

There was therefore no consensus view on the interpretation of 'Day' by the Church Fathers, and Christians are still free to hold different opinions. Early Christians commonly believed that each of the six days had a figurative sense of one thousand years, based on 2 Peter 3:8 "One day with the Lord is as a thousand years." Calculations of the date of Creation from genealogies in the Old Testament suggested about 5,500 B.C., which led them to reckon that the world would end about A.D. 500, after its allotted span of 6,000 years (equivalent to the six days of Creation). Evident illogicalities in the order of Creation were recognised in those days, for example the sun being created on the fourth day, so that the first three days could hardly have been ordinary solar days. Another view was that the creative acts were the parts of the Creation account that were revealed to Moses on successive days, and recorded like his diary.

It was the development of the science of geology in the 18th century that began to raise serious doubts about the historical accuracy of the Genesis record. The story of the Flood seemed an inadequate explanation of the fossil distribution and stratigraphic patterns of rock

formations, which suggested (a) several separate flooding and repopulating events, (b) much greater time would have been required than the known human history. Biologists also questioned the great ages of men recorded in Genesis, and found the concept of all species being represented on the Ark, surviving a year, and then dispersing over the globe, increasingly at odds with the discoveries of the great variety of life and its distribution. (17)

Christian scientists, trying to harmonise ('concordism') the Genesis days with the long geological ages, proposed two main approaches, supporters of each being still found today.

- (a) Day-Age theory - suggesting that each 'day' was a much longer epoch of time, not necessarily of equal length, in which the creative acts occurred.
- (b) The Gap theory - in which an indefinite time span is assumed to have elapsed between Genesis 1:1 and 1:2, during which the sedimentary events largely took place, Noah's Flood being judged to be of relatively minor significance in geological terms. Also known as the 'ruin-and-reconstruction theory', it contends that a great cataclysm left the earth "void and empty and darkness was on the face of the deep" [Gen.1:2]. Some Catholic commentaries have interpolated nuances of this gratuitous conjecture. Dr. Knecht notes: "Void. Which means that it was an unformed mass, all confusion and chaos." (18) The cataclysm may be explained as divine judgement because of the sin of Satan, following which God 're-created' the world in six literal days.

It must be admitted that neither of these ideas corresponds very well with current evolutionary theory, and both require a distorted exegesis of Scripture, creating more problems than they claim to solve. Catholics have tended in recent years to favour a purely allegorical sense, making no serious attempt to harmonise science with the literal account. (19) Christian evolutionists like to point out the co-incidence between the sequence of events on the creation days and the theory of evolution. There are in fact very few similarities, but over fifty complete contradictions! (20) The creation of habitats before inhabitants is only logical, as is the description of the lower orders of life before the higher, culminating in Man to emphasise his dominion over creation. There is not the slightest hint of evolution here, nor anywhere else in Scripture. On the contrary, it is emphasised ten times that each type of living thing is created 'after its kind'. The order of creation disagrees with evolution in many ways, for example, if plants were evolved millions of years before insects, pollination would have been impossible for most of them, and they could not have reproduced and survived.

Modern Creation Science

A growing number of scientists and theologians in recent years have concluded from their researches that it is reasonable to accept the Days of Creation in Genesis in a literal sense.

(21) They maintain:

- (a) all theories of evolution are devoid of scientific proof, and are overwhelmingly denied by the known facts and laws of nature;
- (b) no current geological theories explain the fossil record and rock formations as well as Flood geology;
- (c) the refusal to acknowledge the cataclysmic effects of the Deluge render uniformitarian assumptions of land formation totally invalid;
- (d) the estimated ages of the physical, palaeontological and biological components of the world are frequently contradictory, and are all based on untestable assumptions as to the initial state of creation, and the constancy of process and decay rates in the past. Many physical processes, relying on uniformitarian assumptions, actually testify to the maximum age of the earth being some 10,000 years.
- (e) astronomical theories like the 'big bang' have been constructed to support organic evolution, and based on little observational evidence and very debatable conjectures.

Creationists carry out original research into origins, much of which has yielded very important evidence, for example:

- 1. Robert Gentry's data on radioactive halos in granite, suggesting virtually instantaneous creation of them, rather than slow cooling as evolution predicts.
- 2. Barry Setterfield's analysis of the decay in the speed of light, suggesting a much faster rate in the past, which would not only drastically reduce estimates of the distance and age of the stars, but also invalidate ages based on radioactive decay rates.
- 3. Thomas Barnes's work on decay of the Earth's magnetic field, setting an upmost limit on the age of the Earth as 10,000 years.
- 4. Steve Austin's research on sedimentation and erosion at Mount St. Helens which argues against the geological column model.
- 5. Guy Berthault's experiments on sedimentology, showing rapid particle sorting and stratification, contrary to current geological theories. (22)

The philosophy of creationism in relation to modern science has been much developed in recent years. The works of Dr. Wilder Smith are particularly useful for their analysis of the impossibility of spontaneous generation of life, and the source of order and design in the universe. He effectively demolishes evolution on the basis of the Laws of Thermodynamics and the science of Information Theory. (23)

Christian creationists have attempted to re-interpret the Genesis account of Creation on the assumption of Special Creation and a young world. Dr. Morris's work "The Genesis Record", published in 1976, is perhaps the most recent detailed commentary. A scientist and Biblical scholar, he co-authored "The Genesis Flood" in 1961, which was of major significance in re-establishing the credibility of the Mosaic account of the Deluge. Another useful treatment is David Watson's "Myths and Miracles". The best known Catholic book is Fr. P. O'Connell's "Science of Today and the Problems of Genesis", first published in 1959, second edition 1969. Although opposed to evolution, and in full conformity with Catholic doctrine, it adopts a 'progressive creation' model, without challenging the geological column. It does contain much useful material on fossil evidence of Man, but refers to no scientific publications later than the 1950's. Consequently, on many issues his opinions are very outdated, having been superseded by better creation theories and much more scientific data. It is time Catholic theologians updated their scientific idea and developed a theology of Creation consistent with modern science and the Faith, as Pope Pius XII asked for over forty years ago. (24)

Geneticist and previous evolutionist Prof. Maciej Giefrtych writes:

"A whole age of scientific endeavour was wasted searching for a phantom. It is time we stopped and looked at the facts. Natural sciences failed to supply any evidence for evolution. Christian philosophy tried to accommodate this unproven postulate of materialistic philosophies. Much time and intellectual effort went in vain leading only to negative moral consequences. It is time those working in the humanities were told the truth." (25)

REFERENCES

1. *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma*, L. Ott, 1960, Tan Books, p.79.
2. *The Genesis Record*, H. Morris, 1976, Evangelical Press p.38. cf. *Handbook of the Christian Religion*, W. Wilmers S.J., 1891 Benziger Bros. pp.200-203.
3. *Introduction to the Bible*, Fr. J. Laux, 1932, Benziger Bros. For a useful section on Creation and evolution, see *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine*, Most. Rev. M. Sheehan, 2nd Edn. 1941, Gill & Son, Dublin. Many of the Psalms strongly echo the Genesis of Creation, for example Psalms 8, 13, 113, 135, 138, 148.
4. *In the Beginning*, Fr. P. Fehlner OFM Conv., first published in "Christ to the World", in 1988 #1,2,3. This detailed theological article is available as a booklet from "Daylight", 19 Francis Avenue, St. Albans, Herts. AL3 6BL. Also sound and useful is *CREATION*, Rev. F.J. Ripley, 1962, CTS.
5. *The Six Days of Creation*, Rev. P. O'Connell, 1969, p.5
6. For a philosophical discussion on 'apparent age', especially in relation to Information Science, see *The Scientific Alternative to Neo-Darwinian Evolutionary Theory*, Dr. A.E. Wilder-Smith, 1987, TWFT Publishers, p. 107
7. *The Catholic Quarterly Review*, 1990, Vol.4 No.1 p.33; Very useful works include: *History of Modern Creationism*, H. Morris, 1984, Master Books, 382pp. *When Christians Disagree - Creation and Evolution*, Ed. D. Burke, 1985, Inter-Varsity Press. *The Rise of the Evolution*

- Fraud*, M. Bowden, 1982, Sovereign Publications, *Science vs Evolution*, M. Bowden, 1991, Sovereign, 238 pp. *Scopes II, The Great Debate*, B. Keith, 1982, Huntingdon House, pp52-56. For further information on Creationist books, tapes, videos and organisations, please write to A.L.G. Nevard at the "Daylight" address (ref. 4)
8. *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, M. Denton 1985, Burnett Books, pp357-8.
 9. *Evolution*, C. Patterson, 1978, British Museum (Natural History), p.145.
 10. *Wilmers*, op.cit. p.148.
 11. e.g. *Evolution and the Existence of God*, Rev. R. Nesbitt, 1971, CTS; 12. Patterson, op.cit. p.148
 13. H. Morris, op.cit. [ref. 7] p.42.
 14. Patterson, op.cit. p.148. For a detailed refutation of theistic evolution, I recommend: *Man's Origin, Man's Destiny*, Dr. A.E. Wilder-Smith, 1974, Telos-International. Excellent also on the social and moral effects of evolutionism is: *The Lie - Evolution*, K. Ham, 1987, Master Books.
 15. *Geotimes*, 1978 - quoted in *Astronomy and the Bible - Questions and Answers*, D. DeYoung, 1988, Baker Book House. Also recommended are: *The Earth, the Stars, and the Bible*, P. Steidl, 1979, Presbyterian and Reformed Pub. Co. *A Brief History of Eternity*, R. Peacock, 1989, Monarch.
 16. O'Connell, op.cit. *Evolution and Theology*, E. Messenger, 1931, Burns, Oates & Washbourne.
 17. *Christianity and the Age of the Earth*, D. Young, 1982, Zondervan Co. This includes a useful history of views on the age of the Earth, and presents arguments against 'young earth' creationism. There are many Christians today who reject evolution, but old to an ancient Earth. "Christians," writes Young, "should not attempt to disprove evolutionary theory by discrediting the antiquity of the Earth." He points out that, "The great majority of pioneer geologists ... [like Smith, Cuvier and Lyell] were Christian men who ... were intent on upholding Scripture ... The traditional ideas of a six-thousand-year-old Earth and a global Flood simply could not account for what they saw." (pp.66-7). The idea of an ancient Earth was never condemned in principle as opposed to Catholic Doctrine.
 18. *A Practical Commentary on Holy Scripture*, F. Knecht, 1910, Herder, p.1. cf. *The Catholic Student's "Aids" to the Bible*, H. Pope, 1918, p.197 "It is particularly noticeable how the Assyrian story personifies the Chaos of the Bible." To us, 'chaos' implies the imperfection of 'disorder', not of incompleteness - but it is Catholic Doctrine that God created a good world, prior to the Fall.
 19. Pope, op.cit. pp 198-199,20. In *The Beginning*, W. Brown, 1989, Centre for Scientific Creation, pp.110-115 lists 57 contradictions between Evolution and Genesis.
 21. For a concise and thoroughly-referenced account of Creation Science, see *The Illustrated Origins Answer Book*, P. Taylor, 1990, Eden Productions.
 22. *Creation Rediscovered*, G. Keane [Catholic], 1991, Credis Pty Ltd, includes reference to all the above, as well as the philosophical, moral and religious issues raised by Evolution. Highly recommended. Obtainable @ £9 from: Holy Cross Bookshop, 4 Brownhill Road, London SE6 2EJ. Totally on the scientific superiority of creation over evolution, *Science Vs Evolution*, M. Bowden, obtainable from Sovereign Publications, P.O. Box 88, Bromley, Kent. BR2 9PF. £7.95.
 23. See refs. 6 and 14.
 24. See *Evolution and the Catholic Faith*, A. Nevard; "Catholic Quarterly Review", 1990 Vol. 4 N o.1.
 25. Keane, op.cit. p.4 (Foreword)

EVOLUTIONIST DECEPTION

Evolutionism is the source and origin of the pseudo-science, false psychology and immoral ethics now destroying the very fabric of society.

On page 3 of this pamphlet, the eminent scientist, Professor **Maciej Giertych**, emphasises the diametrical opposition and the irreconcilable contradiction between

1. the evolutionist faith that the world began in chaos after the alleged *Big Bang* but continues to move towards perfection and maximum organisation, and
2. the creationist faith that the world was once perfect but is now declining towards disorganisation and chaos.

THE PURPOSE OF THIS PAMPHLET

- to emphasise the destructive social effects of evolutionism and
- to make more widely known the science, still censored and excluded from education and the media, which refutes evolutionism and restores faith in God who created us and eternally loves us.

First published as a pamphlet by

NEWMAN GRADUATE EDUCATION

[copied with permission]

Published June, 1993 by Newman Graduate Education,

14 Park St, Sydney, Australia.

Extra copies: \$1.00 posted, from N.G.E.,

7 Kambora Ave, Frenchs Forest, NSW 2086.

AUSTRALIA

Evolutionist Deception

"Take care that no one deceives you, . . . Many false prophets will arise; they will deceive many. . ." Mt. 24:4,11

Evolutionism has deceived many, including Church leaders, who are unaware that it is essentially a materialist religion in conflict with Christianity and modern science. We wish to argue that evolutionism is diametrically opposed to Christian faith in creation by God; that evolutionism is bad science and worse theology.

If, as 'theistic evolution' maintains, an evolutionary process was God's method of creation, let us be clear about the basic doctrines of the evolutionist faith. The evolutionist faith is that the cosmos began automatically without God; that "the universe is some 20 thousand million years old, and our Earth itself some 4.6 thousand million years old"¹; that life originated by 'spontaneous generation'; that "the first living organism evolved at least 3.5 billion years ago"²; that animal life evolved by 'natural selection' without divine intervention into sub-human apes which were the ancestors of mankind; that all existence is material and is evolving towards perfection (see Giertych, page 3 below).

For this theory which is sheer speculation there is not a shred of scientific evidence. In fact the most reputable scientists maintain that it is conceptually impossible. (cf Dr Michael Denton, page 7 below.)

Let us now consider the logical consequences of the evolutionist faith in relation to the teachings of the Christian religion.

Those who profess faith in religion and morality should be the first to reject the theory of evolution because it does away with the rational basis for any moral code of human behaviour. In evolution there is no

¹ A.G. Wheeler, *Quadrant*, March 1967, p. 59.

² M. Archer, *The Australian*, 15th April 1993, p. 7.

place for any ethical imperatives such as The Ten Commandments. Without belief in God as creator, divine commands are meaningless.

Neither can there be any secular ethical code, such as consideration for human welfare, because in evolutionism all human conduct, like any other natural activity, is mechanistic and 'determined'. It just 'happens', without impetus from what Christians understand as Free Will. Without freedom of will, of course, there is no distinction between right and wrong. It would therefore be futile to try to change or correct any conduct however evil, such as rape, murder, pillage, torture, genocide . . . In evolutionism, all such horrors are merely natural; to prosecute them would be unrealistic.

How then can anyone who professes Christian faith and morality support a theory which generates so much evil?¹

Although it may not be clear to theistic evolutionists that evolutionism is essentially atheistic, the accredited producers of the theory have no doubts about its implications. They declare, "Evolution destroys utterly and finally the very reason Jesus' earthly life was supposedly made necessary. Destroy Adam and Eve and the original sin, and in the rubble you will find the sorry remains of the son of God . . . then Christianity is nothing."²

Clearly evolutionism contradicts creationism. Why then in Religious Education is the former accepted and the latter ridiculed? The answers include:

¹ Dealing with this anomaly is the English periodical *Daylight, Creation Science for Catholics*, edited by Anthony Nevard, B.Sc., 19 Francis Avenue, St. Albans, Herts AL3 6BL, England.

For a tape of Nevard's lecture *Creation Science - the Catholic Revival*, send A\$5.00 (includes postage within Australia) to John Doran, N.S.W. 764).

² G. Richard Bozarth, 'The Meaning of Evolution', *American Atheist*, Feb. 1978, p. 30

1. Church leaders, still haunted by the ghost of Galileo, are obsessed with a fear of being seen to oppose 'scientific progress' if they reject evolution.
2. Theistic Evolution still endorses the imaginative theories of Fr Pierre Teilhard de Chardin, S.J. (1881 - 1955) who masterminded the 'missing link' hoaxes of Piltdown Man (1912) and Peking Man (1929). His influential books, including *The Phenomenon of Man* overturn the Church's infallible teaching on creation by God. Commenting on Teilhard's boast that "with the help of friends in good strategic positions . . . I have won the game", Fr Paul Wickens writes, "He wanted to corrupt the seminaries, and he did. He wished to plant the seeds of Modernism and Scepticism, and he succeeded".¹

Evolutionism clearly conflicts with the Christian religion. Now let us see how it relates to truth in science.

The Creation/Evolution debate

According to Dr Maciej Giertych, Professor of Genetics in the Polish Academy of Sciences, the crux of the evolution debate is the conflict between two diametrically opposite faiths:

1. **EVOLUTIONISM**—"A once-disorganised world (in chaos after the alleged *Big Bang*) has undergone evolutionary sequences of changes—first in particles, then in molecular chemistry, and finally biological with formation of man—all moving towards perfection in an ideal state of maximum organisation." [This is a materialist position which denies creation by God and rejects any possibility of supernatural origin or future.]
2. **CREATIONISM**—God "created the world (once non-chaotic, beautiful and perfect) which is now declining, for some reason,

¹ Fr P. Wickens, *Christ Denied*, TAN Books, Rockford, Illinois, 1982 p. 25

and burning out, deteriorating, running down towards a lower state of organisation—towards disorganisation and chaos. . .”
[Only God can alter this situation.]

“This is primarily a philosophical question. Natural scientists have only an extremely brief time period available for analysis and observation. What do we observe in it? Advancement or regression? Formation of new and better forms or of poorer, more defective ones, and the irreversible extinction of some? Does the amount of energy in circulation increase or decrease?”¹

Answering the Evolutionist case

Charles Darwin (1809 - 1882) looked to *palaeontology* (study of fossil remains of organisms) for confirmation of his theory of the evolution of all species from common ancestor(s). He maintained that “the number of intermediate and transitional links between all living and extinct species must have been inconceivably great”.² However, the British evolutionist, Professor Le Gros Clark asserts, “that no such ‘intermediate type’ fossil has ever been discovered is now admitted by evolution scientists”.³

Reporting on the findings of the Geological Society of London and the Palaeontological Association of England, Professor John N. Moore said, “Some 120 scientists, all specialists, prepared 30 chapters in a monumental work of more than 800 pages presenting the fossil record for plants and animals divided into about 2,500 groups . . . Each major form or kind of plant and animal is shown to have a *separate and distinct* history from all the other forms or kinds . . . Groups of both plants and

¹ Maciej Giertych, in J.W.G. Johnson, *Na bezdrodach teorii ewolucji*, [The Crumbling Theory of Evolution], Wydawnictwo Michalineum, Warsaw, 1989, preface.

² Charles Darwin, *Origin of Species*, page 293.

³ David Bird, *Evolution: Fact or Faith?*, Melbourne, 1992, page 9.

animals appear **suddenly** in the fossil record . . . Whales, bats, horses, primates, elephants, hares, squirrels, etc. are all as distinct at their first appearance as they are now. *There is not a trace of common ancestor.*" Professor Moore concludes, "No transitional forms have been found in the fossil record very probably because *no transitional forms exist* in fossil stage at all. Very likely, *transitions* between animal kinds and/or transitions between plant kinds *have never occurred*".¹ (Emphasis added.)

Monkey men?

Evolutionists' attempts to find Darwin's 'transitional links' resulted only in a disreputable series of fraudulent 'discoveries' of fictional 'Monkey Men':

Piltdown Man (1912)

Fragments of ape skulls of widely different ages, were 'treated' to make them appear very old. For forty years the public was deceived, but now it is universally acknowledged 'Piltdown Man' was a deliberate fraud, promoted by Fr Teilhard de Chardin, S.J.

Nebraska Man (1922)

A bone fragment was accepted in the 1925 Scopes 'Monkey Trial' as evidence of human evolution and as a warrant for teaching evolution as a fact to school children. In 1927 however, it was disclosed in *Science*² that the only evidence for even the existence of Nebraska Man was a single tooth—the tooth of a pig.³

¹ *ibid*, page 12.

² 66:579

³ Gish, p.188.

Peking Man (1929)

All the fossils of this alleged hominid (ape-like man), discovered by Teilhard de Chardin and others, mysteriously disappeared before they could be investigated—all except two teeth.

Java Man (1891 - 1938)

A fossilised portion of a skull-cap found in 1891 was alleged to belong to an ape-man. In 1938 its 'discoverer', Dr Eugene Dubois, admitted that it belonged to a monkey, a "giant gibbon".

Other candidates for fame as our ape-men ancestors, such as *Ramapithecus* (1972) and *Lucy* (1975) periodically appear and achieve brief popularity. However, reputable evolutionists, such as Richard and Mary Leakey, admit that these specimens are distinctively either apes or human—but never intermediate transitional forms.¹

Although ruled as non-existent by scientists, all these fictional monkey-men are still illustrated as genuine in children's text books and modelled in museums to deceive the public.

Molecular Biology

The naive assumption that similarity in outward appearance indicates close relationship and common ancestry of apes and humans is demolished by recent advances in the science of molecular biology. Dr Patrick Gill, F.R.C.R., points out, "As there are at least 3000 million units in the D.N.A. chain, the real 'mismatch' between humans and chimpanzees works out at 30 million per cell, which any scientist or doctor knows to be an unbridgeable chasm".²

¹ Richard Leakey, *The Making of Mankind*, ABC TV, Melbourne, 24 April, 1983.

² P. Gill, F.R.C.R., *Medical Journal of Australia* 152, April 1990.

Molecular biologist Dr Michael Denton writes: "We now know, as a result of discoveries made over the past thirty years, that not only is there a distinct break between the animate and inanimate worlds but that it is one of the most dramatic in all nature, absolutely unbridged by any series of transitional forms and like so many of the other major gaps of nature, the transitional forms are not only empirically absent but are also conceptually impossible".¹ (our emphasis)

Homology (Similarity)

Evolutionists argue that a similarity of structure in the bones of the forelimbs of man, horse, bat, whale, rat and dog is evidence that these organisms share a common ancestry. Against this, Professor Gavin de Beer states that the science of genetics shows that despite superficial similarities in animal structure, "it is now clear that inheritance of homologous structures cannot be ascribed to identity of genes . . . The attempt to find homologous genes has been given up as hopeless".²

'Embryological recapitulation'

Another misinterpretation of superficial similarity is the so-called 'Recapitulation Theory of Evolution' still found in school text-books. This theorises that the human embryo, like all other embryos, takes on during its early development the appearance of 'evolutionary ancestors'. However, scientific research of embryonic development of heart, brain, glands and other organs reveals that apparent similarities (e.g. what appear to be 'gill slits' in human embryos) are essentially different. Embryos of different species exhibit specific differences in the same way as do fully developed organisms.

¹ Michael Denton, *Evolution: A Theory in Crisis*, Burnett, London, 1985, p. 347.

² Gavin de Beer, *Homology, An Unsolved Problem*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1971, quoted in Bird.

Evolution geology

Evolutionists speculate that evolving life rose upwards from bacteria in the Pre-Cambrian period (3000 million years ago) to Man in the Pleistocene period (one million years ago). This speculation which is paraded as a scientific fact is illustrated in an imaginary 'Geologic Column' with diagrams of fossil-bearing rocks in the strata. Professor Maciej Giertych comments, "The absurd situation arises wherein fossils are dated by the geological strata, but the strata are, in turn, dated by the fossils . . . The dates of geological eras as given in textbooks were proposed in the 19th century and have nothing whatsoever to do with isotope dating".¹

Evolutionist notions of cosmological and geological age always depend on this kind of circular argument, and they go on to speculate, without any empirical evidence, in terms of mega-billions of years, about the age of all visible matter.

For readable scientific refutations of Evolution Geology see the list of texts recommended on the back of this pamphlet.

FOR CREATIONISTS ONLY

At this point Professor Giertych raises the vital issue of the human soul, an issue on which evolutionists – materialists – have a closed mind. Creationists, on the other hand, realise that man is not merely material but is also spiritual, a being with an immortal soul.

Giertych quotes Polish historian/philosopher Feliks Kornešny who has shown that "in the development of mankind there is such a thing as ethical development—elevation of moral standards to a higher level . . . In history there operate laws which have nothing to do with the

¹ Maciej Giertych, in J.W.G. Johnson, *Na bezdrodach teorii ewolucji*, [The Crumbling Theory of Evolution], Wydawnictwo Michalineum, Warsaw, 1989, preface.

laws of nature because they concern the spirit and not matter . . . They determine the relation between a civilisation and its development . . .

“There is no doubt Adam did not start from zero. He received from God some civilisation. He also received a soul. Biological (physical) evolution is but a postulate of evolutionists. Spiritual development, however as well as spiritual regression are historically observable facts . . . Such is the sense of soul.”¹

The evolutionist retreat from spiritual reality and blind faith in ‘Natural Selection’ deprives us of an appreciation of the beauty of God’s creation and His love for what He creates:

*Look how the wild flowers grow . . . Not even Solomon, as rich as he was, had clothes as beautiful as one of these flowers. It is GOD² who clothes the wild grass . . . How little faith you have.*³

What to do

1. **DISTRIBUTE** NGE pamphlets to as many people as possible, or send us names and address (confidentially if preferred) and we will forward them.
2. **PROTEST** against the censorship in schools and the media of the scientific evidence which shows that evolutionism is false and that creation by God is true.

¹ Maciej Giertych, in J.W.G. Johnson, *Na bezdrodach teorii ewolucji*, [The Crumbling Theory of Evolution], Wydawnictwo Michalineum, Warsaw, 1989, preface.

² The claim that God created by an evolutionary process is refuted by modern science as documented in Anthony Nevard’s tape *Creation Science - the Catholic Revival*. To obtain tape, see page 2 above, footnote 1.

³ Lk 12: 27

THE FUNERAL OF A GREAT MYTH

(extracts) from 'Christian Reflections'

by C.S.Lewis

The basic idea of the Myth [of Evolutionism, Ed.] - that small or chaotic or feeble things perpetually turn themselves into large, strong, ordered things - may, at first sight, seem a very odd one. We have never actually seen a pile of rubble turning itself into a house. But this odd idea commends itself to the imagination by the help of what seem to be two instances of it within everyone's knowledge. Everyone has seen individual organisms doing it. Acorns become oaks, grubs become insects, eggs become birds, every man was once an embryo. And secondly - which weighs very much in the popular mind during a machine age - everyone has seen Evolution really happening in the history of machines. We all remember when locomotives were smaller and less efficient than they are now. These apparent instances are quite enough to convince the imagination that Evolution in a cosmic sense is the most natural thing in the world. It is true that reason cannot here agree with imagination. These apparent instances are not really instances of Evolution at all. The oak comes indeed from the acorn, but then the acorn was dropped by an earlier oak. Every man began with the union of an ovum and a spermatozoon, but the ovum and the spermatozoon came from two fully developed human beings. The modern express engine came from the *Rocket* : but the *Rocket* came, not from something under and more elementary than itself but from something much more developed and highly organised - the mind of a man, and a man of genius. Modern art may have 'developed' from savage art. But then the very first picture of all did not evolve itself : it came from something overwhelmingly greater than itself, from the mind of that man who by seeing for the first time that marks on a flat surface could be made to look like animals and men, proved himself to excel in sheer blinding genius any of the artists who have succeeded him. It may be true that if we trace back any existing civilization to its beginnings we

shall find those beginnings crude and savage : but then when you look closer you usually find that these beginnings themselves come from the wreck of some earlier civilization. In other words, the apparent instances of, or analogies to, Evolution which impress the folk imagination, operate by fixing our attention on one half of the process. What we actually see all round us is a double process - the perfect 'dropping' an imperfect seed which in its turn develops to perfection. By concentrating exclusively on the record of upward movement in this cycle we seem to see 'evolution'. I am not in the least denying that organisms on this planet may have 'evolved'. But if we are to be guided by the analogy of Nature as we now know here, it would be reasonable to suppose that this evolutionary process was the second half of a long pattern - that the crude beginnings of life on this planet have themselves been 'dropped' there by a full and perfect life. The analogy may be mistaken. Perhaps Nature was once different. Perhaps the universe as a whole is quite different from those parts of it which fall under our observation. But if that is so, if there was once a dead universe which somehow made itself alive, if there was absolutely original savagery which raised itself by its own shoulder strap into civilization, then we ought to recognise that things of this sort happen no longer, that the world we are being asked to believe in is radically unlike the world we experience. In other words, all the immediate *plausibility* of the Myth has vanished. But it has vanished only because we have been thinking it will remain plausible to the imagination, and it is imagination which makes the Myth : it takes over from rational thought only what it finds convenient. (...)

The Myth also pleases those who want to sell things to us. In the old days, a man had a family carriage built for him when he got married and expected it to last all his life. Such a frame of mind would hardly suit modern manufacturers. But popular Evolutionism suits them exactly. Nothing *ought* to last. They want you to have a new car, a new radio set, a new everything every year. The new model must always be superceding the old. For this is evolution, this is development, this is the way the universe itself is going : and 'sales-resistance' is the sin against the Holy Ghost. the *élan vital*.

ARTIFICIAL EVOLUTION ?

Professor Maciej Giertych

G.F.Joyce in a "Scientific American" article (Dec.1992- I have seen the Polish version of this magazine, "Swiat Nauki", no.2(18) Feb 1993) describes how "directional molecular evolution" has been achieved in a laboratory. Using a target molecule, another functional molecule, able to hold (immobilize) the target molecule, can be artificially produced and multiplied. Simultaneously a DNA or RNA molecule is produced with information for the production of the functional molecule. All of this is achieved by polymerisation of DNA or RNA molecules using polymerases but allowing or promoting errors in transcription to achieve sequence diversities. From a multitude of forms those are selected which best fit the target molecule, and these are polymerised again. This process is continued until the desired functional molecule is obtained.

For Joyce, this is "directional evolution". He expects further achievements, e.g. the production of a macromolecule that would be able to catalyse its own replication. Thus molecules would be able to develop through self-replication. This would be artificial life. Directional evolution aimed at copying life would thus itself create life.

One of the illustrations to his paper shows about 50 different keys and one lock - to demonstrate diversity. The paper does not say this but obviously what is indicated is that putting random cuts onto keys will never produce one fitting the lock. But if we select keys that partially fit the lock, reproduce them with the sectors of the key that already fit unchanged, and diversify the non-fitting sectors, we shall gradually approach the design needed to open the lock. This is what Joyce does in the experiments he describes. This is also what breeders do.

In breeding we have a specific objective, say a dog with a very long tail (target). We have a biological, reproducing system (the breeding population). We have a mechanism that creates diversity (recombination, outbreeding). We have a selection mechanism that picks up

forms closer to the target and rejects those distant from it (the selector). We have a means of protecting the selected forms from further diversification (isolation). We allow them to reproduce again within the isolated population (inbreeding). We repeat the selection, isolation, replication operation till we obtain a gene pool restricted to what we aimed at to start with.

Phillip E. Johnson, in his excellent *Darwin on Trial* (Regnery Gateway, Washington) writes (p.17): "The analogy (of evolution) to artificial selection is misleading. Plant and animal breeders employ intelligence and specialised knowledge to select breeding stock and to protect their charges from natural dangers. The point of Darwin's theory, however, was to establish that purposeless natural processes can substitute for intelligent design."

Let us now ask ourselves whether cutting keys, breeding, or Joyce's "directional molecular evolution", bear any relation to Darwin's evolution.

To start with there is a predetermined design. The lock. The long-tailed dog. The target molecule.

Secondly there is a selection mechanism that picks up forms closer to the target. Checking key with the lock. Measuring tail length. Filtering off molecules that do not attach themselves to the target molecule.

Thirdly, forms approaching the target are protected from losing the acquired similarity to the target before they have a useful design, before they are protected against diversification by the usefulness of this design. Useful cuts are memorised. Dogs with longer tails are isolated. Only selected molecules are allowed to polymerise.

Fourth, there is a sufficient supply of raw materials. Uncut keys. Fodder. Replicase and triphosphate ribonucleotides.

Finally, the program operates thanks to an already-existing biological system that knows what the design is and performs the various functions accordingly. The locksmith. The breeder. The experimenter.

This is not aimless improvement. This is the work of an intelligence striving towards a specific goal and using purposefully all available information.

By evolution we understand a situation where:

- there is no pre-determined design or target;
- natural selection picks up only such forms which are best adapted for replication now;
- the selected forms are not isolated from the rest of the breeding population;
- there are environmental restrictions;
- no-one runs the show.

It is improper to equate biological evolution with, say, "engine evolution". Authors should refrain from drawing "evolutionary" conclusions from data indicating that the inventor, breeder or experimenter simply achieved what he aimed for.

oooOooo

Darwin on Trial is indeed a well-written and valuable book. Written from the analytical viewpoint of an academic lawyer, it leaves aside the religious and Biblical issues, and focusses entirely on science and logic.

"My purpose is to examine the scientific evidence on its own terms, being careful to distinguish the evidence itself from any religious or philosophical bias that might distort our interpretation of that evidence...The question I want to investigate is whether Darwinism is based upon a fair assessment of the scientific evidence, or whether it is another kind of fundamentalism."

Johnson covers the legal setting in USA, Darwinism, mutations, fossils, comparative biology, origin of life and the nature of Science, and reviews the effects of evolutionism on education. He even concludes that Darwinism is "a creation myth".

"A creationist appropriately starts with God's creation and God's will for man. A scientific naturalist just as appropriately starts with evolution and with man as a product of nature."

Perhaps this is the book to open the minds of theistic evolutionists ! The writer is "not a defender of creation-science". Ed.

Monarch Publications,

6 1HQ.

ISBN 1 85424 265 6 1994. p/b. 194pp. £7.99.

"TELEGRAPHOLOGY"

News extracts from 'The Daily Telegraph'

THE SEARCH FOR ALIEN LIFE

Multi-million dollar radio-telescope quest of 212 stars visible from New South Wales. Stars have been selected which are "roughly the age and temperature of the Sun, which the SETI astronomers believe will give the best chance of some having planetary systems... Project Phoenix is looking for signs of highly intelligent civilisations which, in times past, have developed technologies akin to, or in advance of, our own. 'We'll take a look at the centre of the galaxy, roughly 25,000 light years away, in case an advanced civilisation has placed a radio beacon there.'

Other astronomers will be told first of a positive discovery. If confirmed,, the secretary-general of the United Nations will be notified for announcement to the world.

No reply will be transmitted without global consensus. By then, we shall all know that we are not alone in the Universe - and science will have presented theologians with another almighty question to explain."

1 Feb.1995.

COMMENT: Have 13 top astronomers nothing better to do for five months ? Most of the "US \$7.3 million raised so far" was donated by computer moguls. Has any superior intelligence among them considered the feasibility of an electronic conversation with a 50,000 year time-lag ? Such is the futility of practical atheism ! Sad and sinister to note the UN given responsibility for the world over the Pope.

'GIANT LEAP BACKWARDS'

"Quasars, the most violently explosive sources of energy in the universe, believed for the past 30 years to be giant black holes, are in fact nothing of the kind." The Hubble telescope failed to reveal predicted material around 11 quasars. "We need to rethink what they are and how they shine." 17 Jan.1995

"SCIENTISTS 'REPRODUCE BIG BANG'"

23 Nov.1994

COMMENT: Well...not exactly! A CERN team has produced high-energy beams of lead ions, in an attempt to produce "quark-gluon plasma" supposedly a very early state of matter

A BILLION YEARS A YEAR !

A recently discovered galaxy 8C 1435+63 is 15 billion light years away, three times the age of Earth. "The previously known most distant galaxy, discovered in 1991, was 13 billion light years away...some stars much nearer to Earth are known to be at least 16 billion years old."

3 Jan.1995

COMMENT: I predict that by 2000 AD, a galaxy 20 billion light years will have been found. Watch this space !

UNINHABITABLE HOLE FOUND !

"There is a huge hole in the great swath of dust and debris that surrounds the southern star Beta Pictoris, which is likely to contain a planetary system...We have detected an extremely large number of comets falling inwards...where the planets are likely to be." But the worlds of Beta Pictoris were unlikely to be habitable because this star is only a few hundred million years old [50 light years away], compared with the Sun's age of five billion years. 2.12.94

COMMENT: Stars young enough to exchange radio signals within a human lifetime are too young to have habitable planets or to have had time for life to evolve. Old ones are too far away for any communication. Forget it, Phoenix !

ICE ON THE MOON ?

Radar from the USA spacecraft Clementine detected a signal of possible water in craters on the dark side. "Lunar ice is considered of great importance (for human colonisation). Some people have even discussed the safety of drinking water that will have existed for nearly five billion years, but have concluded that it will be no different from drinking the water that fell as rain in the past few days."

16 Dec.1994

COMMENT: I am confused ! My bottle of 'PURE NATURAL MINERAL WATER' informs me : "After its filtration period of up to 50 years or more the water is released from some 300 feet down in the 90,000,000 year old chalk strata..." On the cap is printed: 'Best before NOV 95' Moon water ? Ugh !!!

1995 - "PASTEUR YEAR"

"A giant of science, peace and wisdom" was how UNESCO described Pasteur, who died 100 years ago. The "father of preventive medicine" founded the Pasteur Institute in 1888. 19 Jan 95
COMMENT: Asimov wrote that "Pasteur's religious feelings led him to reject Darwin's theory." Clearly he was too good a scientist as well as a Catholic.

COME ON DOWN?

Charles Darwin's home-Down House, Kent - is visited by no more than 6000 people a year, but it "should be one of the great pilgrimage places of England...This very Victorian home is where the modern world began." The Natural History Museum has launched a £2 million appeal. 12 Dec.1994

DINOSAUR DNA ?

"Dinosaur genes have been discovered in bone fragments 80 million years old, scientists claim...The researchers compared the genetic sequences with those from a wide range of modern animal species and found the ancient DNA to be at least 30% different from those of modern birds, reptiles and mammals." 18 Nov.1994

COMMENT: Scientific observations suggest that DNA from dead material could not remain beyond about 10,000 years. Radio-carbon dating and Laser Mass Spectrometry have yielded dates of less than 30,000 years. If dinosaur DNA can be analysed, the age of the fossils must be drastically scaled downwards.

LIVING FOSSIL

A species of pine tree thought to have died out 150 million years ago found in New South Wales. 15 Dec.'94

OLDEST GYMNOSPERMA IN THE WORLD ?

Researchers estimate a sprawling huon pine tree discovered in Tasmania is at least 10,500 years old.

30 Jan.1995

COMMENT: Exact details of the criteria for dating were not given, but could be based on area covered and current growth rates (not on 'annual rings', as they are not formed in conifers). It is likely that varying past conditions would justify a reduction in the above estimate of age, which does not tally with current Flood geology theories.

ICE-AGE MURALS 20,000 BP.

Hundreds of paintings and engravings of high quality have been found in caves in Southern France. They feature mammoths, bison, wild oxen, ibex, lions, bears, horses, hyenas, reindeer, woolly rhinoceros, a panther and an owl.

19 Jan.1995

'NEW AGE' DANGER TO THE MIND

Eastern cults, paganism, witchcraft, self-awareness therapy and other New Age religions are inducing profound mental disturbances in young people. Such movements "had phenomenal success in moving into the spiritual vacuum left by the collapse of organised religion." 23 Nov.1994

Drama in the Rocks

GUY BERTHAULT - SEDIMENTOLOGIST

SCIENTIFIC REBUTTAL OF THE HISTORICAL BASIS OF EVOLUTION THEORY

Science requires all reality to be explained by naturalistic causes. There is nothing new in this approach, it can be traced back to 1859 when Charles Darwin published his *Origin of the Species*. At that time an intellectual elite was seeking naturalistic explanations to the origin of life. They were so enthusiastic about Darwin's ideas that they overlooked the weaknesses in the theory. Their overriding interest was to find an alternative to the divine causes that Biblical based religions proposed to explain origins.

Today, science requires students to accept Evolution of the species as a « fact ». Educational authorities and text book publishers comply

with this requirement. Arguments against Evolution are considered as a negative approach and consequently not published. Students are encouraged to discuss all aspects of Evolution but not to dispute it.

The continuing lack of empirical proof that macro-evolution has taken place, guarantees a Nobel Prize to any scientist finding it. Evolution is, nevertheless, claimed by the scientific establishment to be an incontrovertible fact. The reason is that the resemblances which exist between species have to be explained naturalistically. As resemblances are assumed to imply common ancestry, the concept of Evolution is introduced. Official science and the educational authorities are aware of the mounting scientific evidence against Evolution as a means of change. Having no other model, however, they are convinced it is only a matter of time before proof is found.

A naturalistic explanation based upon Evolution requires that life in all its forms must be the result of random chance. Richard Dawkins, one of today's leading evolutionary biologists, confirms this official scientific position in his book *The Blind Watchmaker*. He admits that the apparent intelligent design in living things, suggests the involvement of a supernatural designer. By using computer programmes linked to imaginative thinking, however, he attempts to show how blind chance and natural selection could produce the same design. Because his ideas are purely naturalistic they are taken very seriously by the scientific community.

In the light of this situation, religions believing in a Creator God might ask themselves why they promote evolution. Perhaps they are unaware that science uses it to provide a non-surpernatural explanation of the origin of life. Do they not know that science declares Evolution to be a « fact » without any empirical proof in its favour ? In any case, this film will help them to see the situation more clearly.

The video *Drama in the Rocks* is unique in that it contests the belief that the sequences of fossils in stratified rock provide historical proof that Evolution has taken place. The experiments and other evidence show that the strata in which creatures and plants are buried, form sideways and not one on top of the other as has always been thought. Fossils in lower strata could, therefore, be younger than fos-

sils in higher strata. The level at which fossils are found is the result of wave direction, speed of current and other factors at the time of burial. Fossil sequences are, therefore, more apparent than real !

Drama in the Rocks is the title of an episode in the video film ***Evolution, Fact or Belief ?*** * *

Due to the impact the ***Drama in the Rocks*** episode has made upon the public, it has been up-dated and reproduced as a separate video film. It has been expanded to include new information and animated graphics. It also incorporates the technical film (***Fundamental Experiments in Stratification***) presented to the Lille National and Recife International Congresses of Sedimentology. The revised production meets the demand from experts and the general public for a scientific rebuttal of the historical basis of Evolution Theory.

This professionally made film is the first ever to challenge the historical « fact » of evolution by means of experimental evidence published in the scientific press.



Drama in the Rocks is obtainable from Peter Wilders, [redacted]

Price \$14 plus \$4 p.p. Cheques drawn on British Banks only

SURNAME :

CHRISTIAN NAME:

ADDRESS :

POSTAL CODE:

TOWN :

COUNTRY :

VERSION : English ☐ French ☐

SYSTEM : Pal ☐ Secam ☐

* A.P.C.S. ("Association Pour la Connaissance de la Science")

Cheque attached for £.....

** The video ***Evolution, Fact or Belief ?*** documents interviews of scientists specialising in those disciplines most closely concerned with Evolution Theory. Each one rejects evolution theory as bad science. Evolution is a concept. The business of science is to explain phenomena not mental constructs. Also obtainable in several languages from Peter WILDERS in Monaco (£18 + £4 p.p.) send fax for further details.